$\mathcal{N} = 2$ Supersymmetric Harmonic Oscillator: Basic Brackets Without Canonical Conjugate Momenta

N. Srinivas[(a)], A. Shukla[(a)*], R. P. Malik[(a,b)]
[(a)] Physics Department, Centre of Advanced Studies,
Banaras Hindu University (BHU), Varanasi - 221 005, India
[(b)]DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,
Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India
E-mails: seenunamani@gmail.com; ashukla038@gmail.com; rpmalik1995@gmail.com

arXiv:1410.2486v3 [hep-th] 10 Sep 2015

Abstract: We exploit the ideas of spin-statistics theorem, normal-ordering and the key concepts behind the symmetry principles to derive the canonical (anti)commutators for the case of a one (0 + 1)-dimensional (1D) $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric (SUSY) harmonic oscillator (HO) without taking the help of the mathematical definition of canonical conjugate momenta with respect to the bosonic and fermionic variables of this toy model for the Hodge theory (where the continuous and discrete symmetries of the theory provide the physical realizations of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry). In our present endeavor, it is the full set of continuous symmetries and their corresponding generators that lead to the derivation of basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators that appear in the normal mode expansions of the dynamical fermionic and bosonic variables of our present $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY theory of a HO. These basic brackets are in complete agreement with such kind of brackets that are derived from the standard canonical method of quantization scheme.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Pb, 03.65.-w, 02.40.-k.

Keywords: $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY harmonic oscillator; symmetry principles; conserved charges as generators; normal ordering; spin-statistics theorem; creation and annihilation operators; canonical (anti)commutators.

*Present address: Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, Mohanpur - 741 246, West Bengal, India

1 Introduction

The quantization of a given classical system becomes very essential when we study this system at an energy scale where the quantum mechanical effects become very important. For instance, for any arbitrary classical matter, the quantum mechanical phenomena become very prominent when we study this system at its atomic/nuclear scale. One of the earliest methods of quantization scheme is the standard canonical method of quantization. This method of quantization invokes primarily *three* basic ideas. First and foremost, we distinguish between the fermionic and bosonic variables/fields of the theory by using the celebrated spin-statistics theorem (which dictates the existence of (anti)commutators at the *quantum* level for such variables/fields). Second, we define the canonical conjugate momenta for the above variables/fields and define the (graded)Poisson brackets at the *classical* level which are promoted to the (anti)commutators at the *quantum* level. Finally, if the variables/fields allow normal mode expansions due to their equations of motion, we express the above (anti)commutators in terms of the creation and annihilation operators (of the normal mode expansions). The above cited basic (anti)commutators, at the variables/fields level, get translated into the basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation/annihilation operators. Normal-ordering is required to make physical sense out of the physical quantities (e.g., Hamiltonian, conserved charge, etc.) when they are expressed in terms of the creation and annihilation operators of the normal mode expansions of the variables/fields.

In our present endeavor, we shall exploit the ideas of spin-statistics theorem[†] and normal-ordering but we shall *not* use *purely* mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta in the quantization of a one (0 + 1)-dimensional (1D) SUSY harmonic oscillator (SUSY-HO) in terms of its creation and annihilation operators. Instead, we shall utilize the ideas of symmetry principles (i.e. continuous symmetries and their generators) to obtain the basic (anti)commutators of this SUSY system (which has been proven to be a model for the Hodge theory in our earlier work [1]). The central claim of our present investigation is the observation that the quantization of a class of theories can be performed *without* the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. These set of theories belong to the models which are tractable physical examples of Hodge theory. In this context, it is very gratifying to state that in a very recent publication [2], we have obtained the canonical brackets for the 1D model of a rigid rotor without taking any help from the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. In the standard method of canonical quantization scheme, the latter definition plays a key role.

At the field theoretic level, it has been shown that the 2D *free* Abelian 1-form gauge theory [3,4] and its *interacting* version (where there is a coupling between 2D Abelian gauge field with Dirac fields [5]) are tractable field theoretic models for the Hodge theory. The common features of all the above citied models for the Hodge theories is the observation that their discrete and continuous symmetry transformations provide the physical realizations of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry. In our recent works [6,7], we have demonstrated that the covariant canonical quantization of the 2D gauge theories can be performed without the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. In fact, we

[†]For our present 1D toy model of SUSY-HO, the spin-statistics theorem implies the existence of (anti)commutators at the quantum level because we cannot define the "spin" (i.e. Pauli-Lubansky vector) for such kind of a 1D toy model.

have shown that the symmetries of these theories, within the framework of Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalism, are good enough to lead to the derivation of the basic (anti)commutators where inputs from the spin-statistics theorem and normal-ordering are required. The noteworthy point is the observation that the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta is *not* required for the derivation of basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators of such a specific class of theories.

In our present investigation, we have chosen the model of 1D SUSY-HO because it contains bosonic as well as fermionic variables which require (anti)commutators for their quantization (at the quantum level). Moreover, as we know, the range and reach of physics behind the system of a harmonic oscillator is very wide as it encompasses in its folds the theoretical ideas from classical mechanics to field and string theories. Thus, it is a very good proposition to say something *novel* about such a widely applicable system of theoretical physics. We establish, in our present endeavor, that there is no need of the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta for the quantization of 1D SUSY-HO as its innate continuous symmetries are good enough to entail upon the existence of basic canonical brackets (i.e. (anti)commutators) at the level of creation and annihilation operators.

Our present investigation has been motivated by the following key and decisive factors. First, the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta is purely *mathematical* in nature. Thus, any *physical* alternative to it is a welcome sign as far as the richness of ideas in theoretical physics is concerned. Second, it is useful to derive the basic canonical (anti)commutators from another method than the *usual* canonical method because it would enrich the tools and techniques in the realm of theoretical physics. Third, to put our ideas and experiences of the 2D free as well as interacting Abelian gauge theories [5,6] on firmer-footings, it is essential to prove the sanctity of these ideas in the context of other examples of Hodge theory. Our present endeavor is an attempt in that direction. Finally, our method of derivation of the canonical (anti)commutators is based on symmetry considerations. Thus, even though algebraically more involved, our method of derivation is *physically* more appealing as far as the quantization of our system is concerned.

The contents of our present endeavor are organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we very briefly mention about the usual $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries of the SUSY-HO and the bosonic symmetry that emerges from their anticommutator. Our Sec. 3 captures the usual method of canonical quantization scheme to derive the (non-)vanishing basic canonical brackets. Sec. 4 of our present paper is devoted to the derivation of basic brackets from the *first* of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries. In Sec. 5, we derive the (anti)commutators that results in from the *other* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY transformations. Our Sec. 6 contains the basic (anti)commutators that emerge from the bosonic symmetry transformations. Finally, we make some concluding remarks and point out a few future directions in our Sec. 7.

2 Preliminaries: continuous symmetries and conserved charges as generators

We begin with the following Lagrangian for the 1D SUSY-HO with mass $m = 1$ and natural frequency ω (see, e.g. [8,1] for details)

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\,\dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\,\omega^2\,x^2 + i\,\bar{\psi}\,\dot{\psi} - \omega\,\bar{\psi}\,\psi, \tag{1}$$

where $\dot{x} = (dx/dt)$, $\dot{\psi} = (d\psi/dt)$ are the generalized "velocities" for the bosonic and fermionic variables x and ψ, respectively. For the bosonic variable x, there are two fermionic ($\psi^2 = 0$, $\bar{\psi}^2 = 0$, $\psi\,\bar{\psi} + \bar{\psi}\,\psi = 0$) variables in the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY theory (at the classical level). The latter are the superpartners of the former. In other words, as we shall see in Eq. (2) below, under the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetry transformations, the bosonic and fermionic variables transform to one-another obeying the basic principles of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY theory of HO.

The above Lagrangian respects the following infinitesimal and continuous $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries[‡] (see, e.g. [1])

$$\begin{aligned} &s_1 x = \psi, \qquad s_1\psi = 0, \qquad s_1\bar{\psi} = i\,(\dot{x} + i\,\omega\,x),\\ &s_2 x = \bar{\psi}, \qquad s_2\bar{\psi} = 0, \qquad s_2\psi = i\,(\dot{x} - i\,\omega\,x), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which are nilpotent (i.e. $s_1^2 = 0$, $s_2^2 = 0$) of order two on the on-shell ($\dot{\psi} + i\,\omega\,\psi = 0$, $\dot{\bar{\psi}} - i\,\omega\,\bar{\psi} = 0$). The above continuous symmetry transformations are generated by the following Noether conserved ($\dot{Q} = \dot{\bar{Q}} = 0$) charges ($Q$ and $\bar{Q}$), namely;

$$Q = (\dot{x} + i\,\omega\,x)\,\psi, \qquad\qquad \bar{Q} = \bar{\psi}\,(\dot{x} - i\,\omega\,x), \tag{3}$$

which are *also* nilpotent ($Q^2 = \bar{Q}^2 = 0$) of order two and they are conserved. The latter property can be checked by using the Euler-Lagrange (EL) equations of motion[§]

$$\begin{aligned} &\ddot{x} + \omega^2\,x = 0, \quad \dot{\psi} + i\,\omega\,\psi = 0, \quad \dot{\bar{\psi}} - i\,\omega\,\bar{\psi} = 0,\\ &\ddot{\psi} + \omega^2\,\psi = 0, \quad \ddot{\bar{\psi}} + \omega^2\,\bar{\psi} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which emerge from the Lagrangian (1) of our present SUSY theory from the least action principle when we demand that $\delta\,S = 0$ for the action integral $S = \int dt L$. It should be emphasized, at this stage, that the Noether theorem does not invoke the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. Rather, it is derived from the action principle (where the physical system follows the trajectory that is described by the EL equations of motion).

[‡]It can be checked that the Lagrangian (1) transforms to the total time derivative under the continuous transformations (2). Thus, the action integral remains invariant for the physically well-defined variables which vanish off at infinity. To be precise, the transformations (2) are the *symmetry* transformations for the action integral.

[§]It will be noted that these *classical* EL equations of motion turn into operator form at the *quantum* level. Thus, their solutions can be expressed in terms of operators (which are nothing but the creation and annihilation operators [cf. (8) below]).

The anticommutator (i.e. $s_\omega = \{s_1,\, s_2\}$) leads to the definition of a bosonic symmetry (s_ω) in the theory. Under this transformation, the variables change as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&s_\omega\, x = \{s_1,\, s_2\}\, x = \dot{x}, \qquad s_\omega\, \psi = \{s_1,\, s_2\}\, \psi = \dot{\psi},\\
&s_\omega\, \bar{\psi} = \{s_1,\, s_2\}\, \bar{\psi} = \dot{\bar{\psi}},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}
$$

modulo a factor of $2i$. The above transformations demonstrate the validity and existence of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries in a our 1D theory because the anticommutator of two SUSY transformations is equivalent to a time-translation. Under the above transformations, the Lagrangian transforms ($s_\omega\, L = \frac{d}{dt}\,[L]$) to its own time-derivative. Thus, the generator of transformations (5) is nothing but the Hamiltonian of our theory[¶], namely;

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_\omega &= \frac{1}{2}\,\dot{x}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\,\omega^2\, x^2 + \omega\, \bar{\psi}\, \psi\\
&\equiv \frac{{p_x}^2}{2} + \frac{\omega^2\, x^2}{2} + \omega\, \bar{\psi}\, \psi \equiv H,
\end{aligned} \tag{6}
$$

where $p_x = \dot{x}$ is the momentum corresponding to the bosonic variable x and H is the canonical Hamiltonian. The latter can be *also* derived by the Legendre transformations as given below, namely;

$$
\begin{aligned}
H &= \dot{x}\, \Pi_x + \dot{\psi}\, \Pi_\psi + \dot{\bar{\psi}}\, \Pi_{\bar{\psi}} - L\\
&\equiv \frac{{p_x}^2}{2} + \frac{\omega^2\, x^2}{2} + \omega\, \bar{\psi}\, \psi,
\end{aligned} \tag{7}
$$

where $\Pi_x = p_x = \dot{x}$, $\Pi_\psi = -i\, \bar{\psi}$, $\Pi_{\bar{\psi}} = 0$ are the canonical conjugate momenta[‖]. In the above computation, we have used the idea of left-derivative with respect to the fermionic variables (i.e. $\Pi_\psi = \partial L/\partial \dot{\psi}$, $\Pi_{\bar{\psi}} = \partial L/\partial \dot{\bar{\psi}}$). This is the reason that there is a negative sign in $\Pi_\psi = -i\, \bar{\psi}$.

3 Basic brackets: standard canonical method

We begin with the following normal mode expansions for the variable $x(t), \psi(t)$ and $\bar{\psi}(t)$ of our present theory of 1D SUSY-HO (see, e.g. [9]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}\,[a\, e^{-i\,\omega\, t} + a^\dagger\, e^{+i\,\omega\, t}],\\
\psi(t) &= b\, e^{-i\,\omega\, t}, \qquad \bar{\psi}(t) = b^\dagger\, e^{+i\,\omega\, t},
\end{aligned} \tag{8}
$$

[¶]It is quite elementary to check that the transformations (s_1, s_2, s_ω) satisfy a beautiful algebra: $s_1^2 = s_2^2 = 0$, $s_\omega = \{s_1,\, s_2\}$, $[s_\omega,\, s_1] = 0$, $[s_\omega,\, s_2] = 0$ in their operator form. This algebra is also mimicked by the charges ($Q,\, \bar{Q}, H$) which is nothing but the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum mechanical algebra $sl(1/1)$ in its simplest form. In our earlier works [1, 16], these algebras are also shown to be identified with the algebra of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry.

[‖]Note that $\Pi_{\bar{\psi}} = 0$ is *not* a primary constraint on the theory because the third term in the Lagrangian (1) can be symmetrized such that $\Pi_{\bar{\psi}} \neq 0$.

which satisfy the EL equations of motion (4). It is the validity of the equations of motion ($\dot{\psi} + i\omega\psi = 0, \dot{\bar{\psi}} - i\omega\bar{\psi} = 0$) which forces us to choose the solutions for ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ as given in (8). In the above, the time-independent dagger and non-dagger operators are the creation and annihilation operators. The following standard canonical (anti)commutators:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[x,\, x] = [\Pi_x,\, \Pi_x] = 0, \\
&[x,\, \Pi_x] = i \equiv [x,\, p_x],\ \Pi_x = p_x, \\
&\{\psi,\, \psi\} = 0, \qquad \{\bar{\psi},\, \bar{\psi}\} = 0, \\
&\{\psi,\, \Pi_\psi\} = i \implies \{\psi,\, \bar{\psi}\} = -1,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}
$$

can be expressed in terms of the creation and annihilation operators as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[a,\, a] = [a^\dagger,\, a^\dagger] = 0, \quad [a,\, a^\dagger] = 1, \\
&\{b,\, b\} = \{b^\dagger,\, b^\dagger\} = 0 \quad \{b, b^\dagger\} = -1,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}
$$

if we exploit the mode expansions given in (8) and use them in the canonical brackets (9). In other words, the basic (anti)commutators of (9) and (10) are equivalent and they imply each-other in a clear-cut fashion. It should be noted that all the rest of the commutators (e.g. $[x, \psi] = 0, [\Pi_x, \psi] = 0, [x, \bar{\psi}] = 0$) are zero. These, in turn, imply that $[a, b] = 0, [a^\dagger, b] = 0, [a, b^\dagger] = 0, [a^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0$, etc.

Against the backdrop of the above arguments, we have the following explicit (anti)commutators

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[x(t),\, x(t)] = [\Pi_x,\, \Pi_x] = 0 \ \Rightarrow [a,\, a] = 0,\ [a^\dagger,\, a^\dagger] = 0, \\
&[x(t), \Pi_x(t)] = [x(t), \dot{x}(t)] = i \quad \Rightarrow [a,\, a^\dagger] = 1, \\
&\{\psi(t),\, \Pi_\psi(t)\} \equiv \{\psi(t),\, \bar{\psi}(t)\} = -1 \Rightarrow \{b,\, b^\dagger\} = -1, \\
&\{\psi(t),\, \psi(t)\} = \{\bar{\psi}(t),\, \bar{\psi}(t)\} = 0 \\
&\Rightarrow \{b,\, b\} = \{b^\dagger,\, b^\dagger\} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}
$$

which are the basic brackets of our present theory in terms of the creation and annihilation operators. All the other possible commutators (e.g. $[a, b] = 0, [a^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0$, etc.), are zero in our theory. In our forthcoming sections, we shall derive these brackets from the symmetry properties without using the definition of canonical conjugate momenta ($\Pi_x = p_x = \dot{x}$ and $\Pi_\psi = \partial L/\partial\dot{\psi} = -i\,\bar{\psi}$). It may be worthwhile to mention, once again, that the latter definitions are *purely* mathematical in nature and there is almost *no* physical intuition involved in it.

We end this section with the remark that we have used here the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta and spin-statistic theorem to obtain the basic brackets at the variable level (cf. (9)). When we express these brackets in terms of the mode expansions, we end up with the basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators (cf. (10), (11)). Thus, the (anti)commutators at the variable level are equivalent** to the

**The brackets, at the level of creation/annihilation operators, are superior in the sense that vacuum state of the theory is defined in terms of annihilation operators and the particle interpretation of quantum theory becomes quite transparent in this set-up.

(anti)commutators at the level of creation/annihilation operators. We note that, in our present derivation, there has been *no* need of normal-ordering at any stage. However, this idea becomes essential and important when we deal with the Hamiltonian formalism and express it (and other relevant quantities) in terms of the creation/annihilation operators.

4 Basic brackets from the *first* transformation of the two $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries: symmetry principles

To derive the basic canonical brackets amongst the creation and annihilation operators, from the symmetry transformations (s_1), first of all, we note that[††]:

$$s_1\,\Phi = -i\,[\Phi,\,Q]_{\pm}, \qquad\qquad \Phi = x,\,\psi,\,\bar{\psi}, \tag{12}$$

where the $\pm$ signs, as subscripts on the square bracket, denote the (anti)commutator for the generic variable Φ being (fermionic)bosonic in nature. Here we have already used the concept of spin-statistics theorem. It can be explicitly checked that the conserved charge $Q = (\dot{x} + i\,\omega\,x)\,\psi$ can be expressed in terms of creation and annihilation operators, using the mode expressions (8), as

$$Q = \frac{+2\,i\,\omega}{\sqrt{2\,\omega}}\,a^\dagger\,b, \tag{13}$$

where we have used $\dot{x} = (-i\,\omega/\sqrt{2\,\omega})\,(a\,e^{-i\,\omega\,t} - a^\dagger\,e^{i\,\omega\,t})$. The above charge automatically appears in the normal-ordered form. Thus, there is no need of the application of normal-ordering. This far, we have used two ideas of the standard method of quantization. These are the spin-statistics theorem and normal-ordering.

We discuss here the explicit derivation of the basic (anti)commutators from the symmetry considerations. In particular, we express the symmetry (and the principles involved in these symmetry transformations) in the language of generators. To begin with, first of all, we focus on the following transformation

$$s_1 x = -i\,[x,\,Q] = \psi. \tag{14}$$

Using the normal mode expression (8) and the expression for Q from (13), we obtain the following basic canonical commutators:

$$[a,\,b] = [a^\dagger,\,b] = [a^\dagger,\,a^\dagger] = 0, \qquad [a,\,a^\dagger] = 1 \tag{15}$$

where we have compared the coefficients[‡‡] of $e^{-i\,\omega\,t}$ and $e^{+i\,\omega\,t}$ from the l.h.s. and r.h.s. Obviously, the r.h.s. (i.e $\psi = b\,e^{-i\,\omega\,t}$) contains only $e^{-i\,\omega\,t}$ but the l.h.s. contains both the exponentials $e^{-i\,\omega\,t}$ as well as $e^{+i\,\omega\,t}$. Thus, it is clear that the coefficient of $e^{+i\,\omega\,t}$, from the

[††]We would like to lay emphasis on the fact that the concept of continuous symmetries and generators in (12) is very basic even in the realm of classical mechanics where the (graded)Poisson brackets are defined between two dynamical variables in the momentum phase space for a given physical system.

[‡‡]Note that we are allowed to do this because $e^{-i\omega t}$ and $e^{-i\omega t}$ are the linearly independent solutions of the differential equation for the 1D SUSY-HO: $(\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + \omega^2)\,\Phi = 0$ where $\Phi = x, \psi, \bar{\psi}$.

l.h.s., should be zero. Some of the basic brackets of (15) have been derived from this input. Moreover, we have also used the basic tricks of the (anti)commutators involving composite operators (so that $[a, a^\dagger\, b] = [a, a^\dagger]\, b + a^\dagger\, [a, b]$, etc.).

Now, we concentrate on the transformations $s_1 \psi = 0$ and $s_1\, \bar\psi = i\, (\dot x + i\, \omega\, x)$. These can be written in terms of the generator Q as

$$\begin{aligned} s_1\, \psi &= -i\, \{\psi,\, Q\} = 0, \\ s_1\, \bar\psi &= -i\, \{\bar\psi,\, Q\} = i\, (\dot x + i\, \omega\, x). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Plugging in the mode expansions from (8) and expression for Q from (13), we obtain the following basic brackets (i.e. (anti)commutators)

$$[a^\dagger,\, b] = 0, \qquad\qquad \{b,\, b\} = 0, \tag{17}$$

from the transformation $s_1\, \psi = 0$. The other transformation $s_1\, \bar\psi = -i\, \{\bar\psi,\, Q\}$ leads to the following basic brackets (i.e. a commutator and an anticommutator), namely;

$$[a^\dagger,\, b^\dagger] = 0, \qquad \{b,\, b^\dagger\} = -1. \tag{18}$$

Ultimately, we note that we have derived the following basic brackets from the transformations s_1 on the generic variable Φ (i.e. $s_1 \Phi = -i[\Phi,\, Q]_\pm$ for $\Phi = x, \psi, \bar\psi$):

$$\begin{aligned} &[a,\, b] = 0, \quad [a^\dagger,\, b] = 0, \quad [a^\dagger,\, a^\dagger] = 0, \quad \{b,\, b\} = 0, \\ &[a^\dagger,\, b^\dagger] = 0, \qquad \{b,\, b^\dagger\} = -1, \qquad [a,\, a^\dagger] = +1, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which are seven in number. Out of the above basic brackets, the non-vanishing brackets are merely two (i.e $\{b,\, b^\dagger\} = -1,\, [a,\, a^\dagger] = +1$). We also point out that the use of Eq. (12) leads to the derivation of all possible brackets. We note that the symmetry considerations in (14) and (16) do *not* yield the bracket $\{b^\dagger, b^\dagger\} = 0$ which is required for the precise and complete quantization.

5 Basic brackets from the *other* transformation of the two $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetries: symmetry principles

We dwell a bit on the nilpotent transformations s_2 and concentrate on the transformation of the bosonic variable x as:

$$s_2\, x = -i\, [x,\, \bar Q] = \bar\psi, \tag{20}$$

where the conserved charge $\bar Q = \bar\psi\, (\dot x - i\, \omega\, x)$ can be expressed in terms of the mode expansions in (8) as:

$$\bar Q = \frac{-2\, i\, \omega}{\sqrt{2\, \omega}}\; b^\dagger\, a. \tag{21}$$

The substitution the mode expansions of (8) into (20) leads to the emergence of the following basic brackets from the transformations (20), namely;

$$[a,\, b^\dagger] = [a,\, a] = [a^\dagger,\, b^\dagger] = 0, \qquad [a,\, a^\dagger] = 1, \tag{22}$$

where we have equated the coefficients of $e^{-i\omega t}$ and $e^{+i\omega t}$ from the l.h.s and r.h.s. Next, the trivial transformations $s_2\,\bar\psi = -i\,\{\bar\psi,\,\bar Q\} = 0$ yields the derivation of $[a,\,b^\dagger] = 0$ and $\{b^\dagger,\,b^\dagger\} = 0$ when we use the basic tricks of the anticommutators with composite operators (e.g. $\{b^\dagger,\,b^\dagger\,a\} = \{b^\dagger,\,b^\dagger\}\,a - b^\dagger\,[b^\dagger,\,a]$, etc.). Finally, the transformations

$$s_2\,\psi = -i\,\{\psi,\,\bar Q\} = i\,(\dot x - i\,\omega\,x), \tag{23}$$

generates the basic brackets that are listed as follows:

$$[a,\,b] = 0, \qquad\qquad \{b,\,b^\dagger\} = -1. \tag{24}$$

In the above derivation, we have compared the coefficients of $e^{-\,i\omega\,t}$ and $e^{+\,i\omega\,t}$ from the l.h.s. and r.h.s. and used the basic tricks of the (anti)commutators with composite operators (e.g. $\{b, b^\dagger a\} = \{b, b^\dagger\}a - b^\dagger[b, a]$). Finally, we observe that $s_2\Phi = -i\,[\Phi,\,\bar Q]_\pm$ (with $\Phi = x,\,\psi,\,\bar\psi$) leads to the following basic (anti)commutation relations amongst the creation and annihilation operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
&[a,\,b^\dagger] = [a,\,a] = [a^\dagger,\,b^\dagger] = [a,\,b] = 0,\\
&\{b^\dagger,\,b^\dagger\} = 0, \quad [a,\,a^\dagger] = +\,1, \quad \{b,\,b^\dagger\} = -\,1.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

A careful observation at (19) and (25) demonstrates that we have already derived *all* the (non-)vanishing brackets amongst the creation and annihilation operators (i.e a, $a^\dagger$, b, $b^\dagger$). The non-vanishing brackets are $[a,\,a^\dagger] = +1$ and $\{b,\,b^\dagger\} = -1$ which are consistent with the ones derived in Sec. 3. We lay emphasis on the fact that the symmetry transformations (s_2) do *not* produce the bracket $\{b,\,b\} = 0$ which is required for the complete quantization.

6 Basic brackets from the bosonic symmetry

In Sec. 2, we have seen that the anticommutator of the nilpotent $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY transformations produces a bosonic symmetry transformation (s_ω). Under this symmetry transformations, we have the conserved (i.e. $\dot Q_\omega = 0$) charge $Q_\omega = \frac{{p_x}^2}{2} + \frac{\omega^2\,x^2}{2} + \omega\,\bar\psi\,\psi$ that can be expressed in terms of the mode expansions (8) as

$$Q_\omega = H = \frac{\omega}{2}\,\left(a\,a^\dagger + a^\dagger\,a\right) + \omega\,b^\dagger\,b \equiv \omega\,\left(a^\dagger\,a + b^\dagger\,b\right), \tag{26}$$

where we have used the normal-ordering to make physical sense out of Q_ω. This expression would be used in the derivation of the transformations $s_\omega\,\Phi = \pm\,i\,[\Phi,\,Q_\omega]_-$ where $\Phi = x,\,\psi,\bar\psi$ and $Q_\omega = H$ (that is given in Sec. 2 as well as in (26)).

To obtain the basic (anti)commutators, first of all, we focus on the transformation of the bosonic variable x. This can be written as

$$s_\omega\,x = -i\,[x,\,Q_\omega] \,=\, \dot x. \tag{27}$$

The l.h.s. and r.h.s. of the above expression can be written in terms of the creation and annihilation operators and exponentials. The comparison of the coefficients of $e^{-i\omega\,t}$ and $e^{+\,i\omega\,t}$ (from the l.h.s. and r.h.s.) yields the following basic commutators:

$$\begin{aligned}
&[a,\,b^\dagger] \,=\, [a,\,b] \,=\, [a,\,a] \,= [a^\dagger,\,b^\dagger] = 0\\
&[a^\dagger,\,b] \,= [a^\dagger,\,a^\dagger] \,=\, 0, \qquad [a,\,a^\dagger] \,=\, 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Thus, we note that the non-vanishing bracket is $[a,\, a^\dagger] \,=\, 1$. Let us now concentrate on the transformations:

$$s_\omega\, \psi = i\, [\psi,\, Q_\omega] \,=\, \dot{\psi}, \qquad s_\omega\, \bar{\psi} \,=\, i\, [\bar{\psi},\, Q_\omega] \,=\, \dot{\bar{\psi}}. \tag{29}$$

Plugging in the mode expansions (8) and comparing the coefficients of $e^{-\,i\omega t}$ and $e^{+\,i\omega t}$ from l.h.s and r.h.s, we obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} &[a,\, b] \,=\, [a^\dagger,\, b] \,=\, \{b,\, b\} = 0, \qquad \{b,\, b^\dagger\} \,=\, -1, \\ &[a,\, b^\dagger] = [a^\dagger,\, b^\dagger] = \{b^\dagger,\, b^\dagger\} = 0, \;\; \{b,\, b^\dagger\} \,=\, -1, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

from the transformations $s_\omega\, \psi = \dot{\psi}$ and $s_\omega\, \bar{\psi} = \dot{\bar{\psi}}$, respectively. Thus, we have obtained *all* the basic (anti)commutators of our theory where the non-vanishing brackets are $[a,\, a^\dagger] = 1$ and $\{b,\, b^\dagger\} \,=\, -1$ (which are equivalent to the basic canonical brackets $[\, x,\, \Pi_x\,] \,=\, i$, $\{\, \psi,\, \bar{\psi}\,\} \,=\, -1$ at the level of the variables).

7 Conclusions

In our present investigation, we have established that, for the models of the Hodge theory, the canonical quantization conditions can be achieved by exploiting the spin-statistics theorem, normal-ordering and symmetry principles. All these ideas are very nicely backed (and bolstered by the physical arguments and insights). For these models, the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta, corresponding to the dynamical variables, are not required. We have corroborated the above statements in the case of 1D SUSY-HO where we have derived the basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation/annihilation operators by exploiting the virtues of symmetry principles and have not used the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta (corresponding to the dynamical variables). For the sake of comparison, we have also derived these brackets from the standard canonical quantization scheme (cf. Sec. 3) so that the sanctity of our results could be clearly and firmly established (in the case of 1D SUSY-HO).

Earlier attempts are present in literature where the alternative methods of the derivation of basic brackets have been proposed. For instance, by exploiting the global spacetime Poincaré group and its generators, it has been shown (in the standard book on quantum field theory [10]) that the canonical brackets can be derived for the bosonic fields and their creation/annihilation operators. However, in our present investigation and earlier works [6,7], we have exploited only the *internal* symmetries of a given theory. Similarly, in a very nice piece of work by Wigner [11], the Heisenberg equations of motion have led to the derivation of basic canonical brackets where, once again, only the bosonic variables/fields have been taken into account. Unlike our present work which is based on the internal symmetries and corresponding symmetry principles, this attempt [11] is also *not* based on such type of internal symmetry considerations.

We lay emphasis on the observation that the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 (and their generators Q and $\bar{Q}$) do *not* produce *all* the (anti)commutators of the theory. As pointed out after (19) and (25), the brackets $\{b^\dagger, b^\dagger\} = 0$ and $\{b, b\} = 0$ are *not* produced by the pairs $(s_1,\, Q)$ and $(s_2,\, \bar{Q})$, respectively. However, the transformations s_ω (generated

by Q_ω) produce all the appropriate (anti)commutators as is illustrated in (30). Thus, we have observed that the results, produced by Q and $\bar{Q}$ *together*, emerge automatically by using $Q_\omega = H$. There is a deeper mathematical reason behind it. It has been shown in [1] that the set $(Q, \bar{Q}, Q_\omega \equiv H)$ provides the physical realizations of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry where $Q_\omega \equiv H$ is identified with the Laplacian operator which is equal to the anticommutator of the exterior and co-exterior derivatives. The (co-)exterior derivatives are identified with the Q and $\bar{Q}$ in the language of the symmetry generators. Thus, it is clear that the consequences, that emerge from Q_ω, would be equivalent to the results obtained by Q and $\bar{Q}$ separately and independently (see, e.g. [1], [16] for detailed discussions). It is worthwhile to mention here that on a compact manifold without a boundary, we define a set of *three* operators (d, δ, Δ) which are known as exterior derivative, co-exterior derivative and Laplacian operators, respectively. They obey the Hodge algebra: $d^2 = \delta^2 = 0, \Delta = \{d, \delta\} \equiv (d + \delta)^2$, $[\Delta, d] = [\Delta, \delta] = 0$ which shows that Δ is like a Casimir operator (see, e.g. [12-15]).

We have proven that the 1D model of a rigid rotor [17], $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum mechanical model with any arbitrary superpotential [16], $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY model for the motion of a charged particle under influence of a magnetic field [18], free 4D Abelian 2-form and 6D Abelian 3-form gauge theories [19-21], etc., are models for the Hodge theory. For all these models, we can perform the canonical quantization without taking recourse to the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. It would be very nice future endeavor for us to accomplish these goals in a clear-cut fashion. These are the problems we are intensively involved with, at present, and the results and findings would be reported in our future publications [22].

Acknowledgements

One of us (AS) would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial support from CSIR, Government of India, New Delhi, under its SRF-scheme. All of us would like to thank our colleague Mr. S. Krishna for carefully reading the manuscript as well as for offering us some crucial, decisive and valuable inputs on the topic of our present investigation.

References

[1] R. Kumar and R. P. Malik, *Europhys. Lett.* **98**, 11002 (2012).

[2] D. Shukla, T. Bhanja and R. P. Malik, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **30**, 1550115 (2015).

[3] R. P. Malik, *J. Phys. A* **35**, 6919 (2002).

[4] See, e.g., R. P. Malik, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **22**, 3521 (2007).

[5] See, e.g., R. P. Malik, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* A **15**, 2079 (2000); *ibid* A **16**, 477 (2001).

[6] S. Gupta, R. Kumar and R. P. Malik, arXiv:1401.2590 [hep-th].

[7] R. Kumar, S. Gupta and R. P. Malik, *Comm. Theor. Phys.* **61**, 715 (2014).

[8] See, e.g., for an excellent exposition, A. Das, *Field Theory: A Path Integral Approach* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).

[9] D. Nemeschansky, C. Preitschopf and M. Weinstein, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **183**, 226 (1988).

[10] See, e.g., N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, *Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields*, Vol. 3, (Interscience Publishers, INC., New York, 1959).

[11] E. P. Wigner, *Phys. Rev.* **77**, 711 (1950).

[12] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey and A. Hanson, *Phys. Rep.* **66**, 213 (1980).

[13] S. Mukhi and N. Mukunda, *Introduction to Topology, Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists*, Wiley Eastern Private Limited, New Delhi (1990).

[14] K. Nishijima, Prog. *Theor. Phys.* **80**, 897 (1988).

[15] J. W. van Holten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 2863 (1990).

[16] R. Kumar and R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J.* C **73**, 2514 (2013).

[17] S. Gupta and R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J.* C **68**, 325 (2010).

[18] R. P. Malik and Avinash Khare, *Ann. Phys.* **334**, 142 (2013).

[19] S. Gupta and R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J.* C **58**, 517 (2008).

[20] R. Kumar, S. Krishna, A. Shukla and R. P. Malik, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **29**, 1450135 (2014).

[21] R. Kumar, S. Krishna, A. Shukla and R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J.* C **72**, 1980 (2012).

[22] R. P. Malik, *etal.*, in preparation.